

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 06 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.: 09/717,332  
Filed: November 20, 2000  
Examiner: J. Hirl  
Art Unit: 2121  
Inventor: Josephson, et al.  
Title: MULTICRITERIAL DECISION  
MAKING SYSTEM AND  
METHOD  
Attorney Docket: OSU1159-074D

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW  
SUMMARY

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(A)	
Date of Deposit:	<u>July 6, 2005</u>
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited facsimile transmission to Patent Technology Center 2100, Art Unit 2121 at 703-872-9306.	
<u>3 pages</u>	<u>Trisha M. Beachy</u> Trisha M. Beachy

Sir:

Pursuant to MPEP 713.04, Applicant is submitting this summary of the substance of  
the June 7, 2005 telephone interview with Examiner Hirl.

U.S. App. Serial No. 09/717,332  
Examiner Hirl  
Art Unit 2121

### REMARKS

On June 7, 2005 at 10:00 AM, Dr. John Josephson, Inventor, and Carol Stovsky, Applicant's representative, participated in a telephone interview with Examiner Hirl to discuss the present application. Prior to the interview, a proposed amendment to the application with new claims was submitted to the Examiner for consideration.

The participants also discussed claim 1 and the Amado reference. The Examiner has maintained that the claims are too general and that the generalized claims are in the prior art. The Examiner suggested that claims are so general as to cover a genetic algorithm and the application of an objective function to a decision alternative. Applicant explained that an objective function considers only one criterion and that the present invention is directed to evaluation of decision alternatives according to multiple criteria. Applicant further suggested that the proposed claims have explicit limitations related to the use of multiple criteria in evaluating, filtering, and examining decision alternatives. Applicant finally suggested that the Amado reference upon which the Examiner has relied is not directed in any way to examination or selection of decision alternatives from a discrete set of decision alternatives and does not discuss or even suggest use of multiple criteria in evaluation, filtering, or examining decision alternatives.

The Examiner suggested rewriting the claims to clarify the steps performed by the software processes of the invention. Applicant agreed to rewrite the claims for clarity and to further emphasize that the present invention supports exploration of

U.S. App. Serial No. 09/717,332  
Examiner Hirl  
Art Unit 2121

decision alternatives according to multiple criteria. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to consider proposed claims in order to identify allowable claim language for the invention.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 6, 2005

By: Carol G. Stovsky  
Carol G. Stovsky  
Registration No.: 42,171  
Standley Law Group LLP  
495 Metro Place South, Suite 210  
Dublin, Ohio 43017-5319  
Tel.: 614-792-5555  
Fax: 614-792-5536  
cstovsky@standleyllp.com